

The applicant has received and reviewed the office action of December 14, 2005 wherein the office rejected claims 1,2, 10-12, 15-18 and 20 but stated that claims 3-6, 13 and 14 contained allowable subject matter and provided suggested changes to claim 16 to overcome the reference.

Applicant hereby submits amended independent claim 1 which now includes the subject matter of allowable claim 3. More specifically, claims 1, 2 and 3 have been combined as amended claim 1 and claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. It is submitted that the amendment places independent claim 1 and dependent claims 4, 5 and 6 into allowable condition.

Applicant has amended independent method claim 10 by combining allowable dependent claim 13 therewith to thereby place amended claim 10 into allowable condition. Accordingly, dependent method claims 11-15 are now also allowable since they depend on allowable independent claim 10.

In regard to claim 16 the office took the position that "the recited limitation on the size of the reflecting surface is not strictly compared to the optical port of the second element as presently written" by pointing out the use of "an optical port rather than said optical port". In order to bring claim 16 into a distinguishing condition claim 16 has been amended to point out the size relationship. The applicant thanks examiner Stahl for the suggestions and an amendment has been made to claim 16 in response to the examiner Stahl's suggestion. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claim 16 and dependent claims 17, 18 & 20 are now in allowable condition

It is submitted that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10-12, 14-18 and 20 are all now in a condition for allowance and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.